

# The effects of dielectric disorder on van der Waals interactions in slab geometries

David S. Dean,<sup>1,2</sup> Ron R. Horgan,<sup>1,3</sup> Ali Naji,<sup>1,4,5</sup> and Rudolf Podgornik<sup>1,6,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Laboratoire de Physique Théorique, IRSAMC, Université Paul Sabatier,  
118 Route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse Cedex 4, France*

<sup>3</sup>*DAMTP, CMS, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Physics, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry,  
and Materials Research Laboratory, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA*

<sup>5</sup>*School of Physics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P.O. Box 19395-5531, Tehran, Iran*

<sup>6</sup>*Department of Physics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics,  
University of Ljubljana and Department of Theoretical Physics, J. Stefan Institute, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

<sup>7</sup>*Laboratory of Physical and Structural Biology, National Institutes of Health, Maryland 20892, USA*

We study the thermal Casimir effect between two thick slabs composed of plane-parallel layers of random dielectric materials interacting across an intervening homogeneous dielectric. It is found that the effective interaction at long distances is self averaging and its value is given by a that between non-random media with the effective dielectric tensor of the corresponding random media. The behavior at short distances becomes random (sample dependent) and is dominated by the local values of the dielectric constants proximal to each other across the homogeneous slab. These results are extended to the regime of intermediate slab separations by using perturbation theory for weak disorder and also by extensive numerical simulations for a number of systems where the dielectric function has a log-normal distribution.

PACS numbers: 03.70.+k, 03.50.De, 05.40.-a, 77.22.-d

## I. INTRODUCTION

Systems with spatially inhomogeneous dielectric constants exhibit effective van der Waals interactions arising from the interaction between fluctuating dipoles in the system [1, 2]. These fluctuation interactions have two distinct components: (i) a classical or thermal component due to the zero frequency response of the dipoles and (ii) a quantum component due to the non-zero frequency/quantum response of the dipoles. Despite the clear physical differences in these contributions, the mathematical computation of the corresponding interaction is almost identical and boils down to the computation of an appropriate functional determinant. The full theory taking into account both of these component interactions is the celebrated Lifshitz theory of van der Waals - dispersion interactions [3], based on boundary conditions imposed on the electromagnetic field at the bounding surfaces and the fluctuation-dissipation theorem for the electromagnetic potential operators. From this formulation one can derive the original Casimir interaction [4] by taking the limit of zero temperature and ideally polarizable bounding surfaces. In this respect the Lifshitz theory is nothing but a proper finite temperature and realistic boundary conditions generalization of the Casimir interaction. The Lifshitz - van der Waals interactions is thus indeed nothing else but the thermal Casimir effect.

The major mathematical problems in the computation of Casimir type interactions (setting aside the experimental and theoretical challenges to determine the correct dielectric behavior) are (i) the application of the Lifshitz approach to non-trivial geometries (*i.e.* beyond the cases of planar, spherical and cylindrical geometries) and (ii) taking into account local inhomogeneities in the dielectric properties of the media, always present in realistic systems and thus relevant for the comparison of theory with experiment. In this paper we will address the second of these points in detail, and to our knowledge we present the first analysis of the effect of dielectric disorder on Lifshitz - van de Waals interactions (apart from a recent letter [5] by the authors on this subject). Specifically, we will consider the thermal (zero-frequency) Casimir interaction for the case where the local dielectric constant is a random variable. Specifically we will consider the interaction between two thick parallel dielectric slabs, separated by a homogenous dielectric medium, see Fig. (1). The dielectric response within the two slabs is constant in the planes perpendicular to the slab normal, but varies in the direction of the surface normal. It is well known that this problem can be solved in the case where the dielectric constants of the slabs do not vary [2] and the result can be tentatively applied to the case of fluctuating dielectrics constants via an effective medium theory which consists of replacing the fluctuating dielectric constant by an effective (spatially homogeneous within each of the slabs) dielectric tensor. Naively one might try the approximation

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \langle \epsilon \rangle, \quad (1)$$




FIG. 1: (Color online) A schematic presentation of the model. Two finite slabs with disordered plane-parallel dielectric layers interacting across a dielectrically homogeneous slab of thickness  $\ell$ .  $z$  axis is perpendicular to the plane of the slabs.

where the angle bracket denotes the spatial or ensemble averaged dielectric constant within the slab in question. However the most commonly used approximation is that, where the local dielectric tensor is replaced by the effective dielectric tensor [1, 2], *i.e.*

$$\epsilon_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \epsilon_{ij}^{(e)}, \quad (2)$$

where the bulk dielectric tensor is defined via

$$\epsilon_{ij}^{(e)} \langle E_j \rangle = \langle \epsilon_{ij} E_j \rangle. \quad (3)$$

The use of the effective dielectric constant is not easily justifiable mathematically as an approximation, although physically the effective dielectric constant clearly does capture the bulk response to constant electric fields. We shall see in this paper, for the random layered dielectric model studied here, that the effective dielectric constant approximation of Eq. (2) does in fact give the correct value of the thermal Casimir interaction when the two slabs are widely separated. One can argue that this is to be expected on physical grounds as the fluctuating electromagnetic field modes with small wave-vector (corresponding to variations on large scales) dominate the Casimir interaction for large inter-slab separation. The dielectric response of the material to a constant electric field is given by the effective dielectric constant and if the wave-vector dependent response is suitably analytic near  $\mathbf{k} = 0$  we expect that  $\epsilon_{ij}^{(e)}(\mathbf{k}) \sim \epsilon_{ij}^{(e)}(0) = \epsilon_{ij}^{(e)}$  for  $|\mathbf{k}| \ll 1$ .

## II. THE MODEL AND GENERAL ANALYSIS

### A. Formulation

The Hamiltonian associated with the thermal fluctuations of the electrostatic field in a dielectric medium is given by the classical electromagnetic field energy

$$H[\phi] = \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{x} \epsilon(\mathbf{x}) (\nabla \phi(\mathbf{x}))^2 \quad (4)$$

and the corresponding partition function is given by the functional integral

$$Z = \int d[\phi] \exp(-\beta H[\phi]). \quad (5)$$

Differences in dielectric constants lead to the thermal Casimir effect which arises from the full treatment of the thermal (zero frequency) van de Waals forces in the system. Here we will consider layered systems where the dielectric constant  $\epsilon$  only depends on the  $z$  direction  $\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) = \epsilon(z)$ . If we express the field  $\phi$  in terms of its Fourier modes in the plane perpendicular to  $z$ , coordinates denoted by  $\mathbf{x}_\perp$  and which we will take to be of area  $A$ , with wave-vector  $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y)$  then the Hamiltonian can be written as

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} H_{\mathbf{k}} \quad (6)$$

with

$$H_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{2} \int dz \epsilon(z) \left( \frac{d\tilde{\phi}(z, \mathbf{k})}{dz} \frac{d\tilde{\phi}(z, -\mathbf{k})}{dz} + \mathbf{k}^2 \tilde{\phi}(z, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\phi}(z, -\mathbf{k}) \right). \quad (7)$$

A direct consequence of this decomposition of the Hamiltonian is that the partition function can be expressed as a sum over the partition function of the individual modes  $Z_{\mathbf{k}}$  as

$$\ln(Z) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \ln(Z_{\mathbf{k}}) \quad (8)$$

where

$$Z_{\mathbf{k}} = \int d[X] \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \int dz \epsilon(z) \left[ \left( \frac{dX}{dz} \right)^2 + k^2 X^2 \right] \right). \quad (9)$$

Here  $k = |\mathbf{k}|$  and we have taken into account that the field  $\phi$  is real.

## B. Evaluation of the functional integral

The problem of computing the interaction between slabs composed of layers of finite thickness can be studied using a transfer matrix like method [6]. However we will use a method based on the Feynman path integral instead, which is particularly well suited to the study of systems where the dielectric constant can vary continuously in only one direction [7]. If we specify the starting and finishing points of the above path integral to be  $x$  and  $y$  respectively at *times*  $z'$  and  $z$  we see that it has to be of harmonic oscillator form defined by

$$K(x, y; z', z) = \int_{X(z')=x}^{X(z)=y} d[X] \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^z dz M(z) \left[ \left( \frac{dX}{dz} \right)^2 + \omega^2 X^2 \right] \right), \quad (10)$$

where the mass, which is  $z$  dependent, is given by  $M(z) = \epsilon(z)$  and the frequency  $\omega$  is given by  $\omega = k$ . In the case where  $M$  and  $\omega$  are constant, the propagator  $K$  is given by the well known formula

$$K(x, y; z', z, M, \omega) = \left( \frac{M\omega}{2\pi \sinh(\omega(z - z'))} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} ((x^2 + y^2)M\omega \coth(\omega(z - z')) + 2xyM\omega \operatorname{cosech}(\omega(z - z'))) \right] \quad (11)$$

In the case where  $M$  (or indeed  $\omega$ ) vary with  $z$  we can still formally compute the path integral via the generalized Pauli - van Vleck formula which tells us that  $K$  must have the general form

$$K(x, y; z', z) = \left( \frac{b}{2\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} a_i(z', z) x^2 - \frac{1}{2} a_f(z', z) y^2 + b(z', z) xy \right). \quad (12)$$

We may now write down an evolution equation for the coefficients  $a_i$ ,  $a_f$  and  $b$  using the Markov property of the path integral (in fact this is how one can prove the generalized Pauli - van Vleck formula [7])

$$K(x, y; z', z + \zeta) = \int dw K(x, w; z', z) K(w, y; z, z + \zeta). \quad (13)$$

Now if we take  $\zeta = \Delta z$  infinitesimal and assume that  $M$  and  $\omega$  are constant over  $(z, z + \Delta z)$  (but could have jumped at  $z$ ), then by looking at the coefficients of  $x^2$ ,  $y^2$  and  $xy$  in the so computed  $K(x, y; z + \Delta z)$  we find the following evolution equations for  $a_i$ ,  $a_f$  and  $b$ :

$$\frac{\partial a_i(z', z)}{\partial z} = -\frac{b^2(z', z)}{M}, \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{\partial b(z', z)}{\partial z} = -\frac{b(z', z)a_f(z', z)}{M}, \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{\partial a_f(z', z)}{\partial z} = M(z)\omega^2(z) - \frac{a_f^2(z', z)}{M(z)}. \quad (16)$$

Note that the evolution equation for  $b$  can also be obtained by examining the change in the pre-factor term of the propagator  $K$ . An equivalent and related way of deriving these equations is to note that, from the Feynman - Kac formula,  $K(x, y; z, z')$  satisfies the Euclidean version of the Schrödinger equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} K(x, y; z', z) = \left( \frac{1}{2M(z)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 y} - \frac{1}{2} M(z) \omega^2 y^2 \right) K(x, y; z', z). \quad (17)$$

Substitution for  $K(x, y; z', z)$  from Eq. (12) then yields the evolution equations (16). As the action is positive definite we expect that both  $a_i$  and  $a_f$  are positive (by considering paths starting or ending at 0). Also for  $|z - z'|$  large, with respect to the correlation length of the disorder, we expect  $K$  to factorize in its  $x$  and  $y$  dependence and thus the coefficient  $b$  should decay to zero for sufficiently thick slabs. Note that if  $\epsilon$  is a stationary process then the path integral should be the same run backwards in time,  $z$ , as when it is run forwards. This means that  $a_i$  and  $a_f$  should have the same steady state distribution.

Consider a system of two thick slabs of respective thicknesses  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  separated by a distance  $l$  and the region between them occupied by a dielectric medium of dielectric constant  $\epsilon_0$  – a vacuum or air, for example. From our discussion above, for large  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  the partition function for the mode  $\mathbf{k}$  is thus proportional to

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\mathbf{k}} = & \int dx dy \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} a_f^{(1)}(k) x^2\right) \left(\frac{\epsilon_0 k}{2\pi \sinh(kz)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} ((x^2 + y^2)\epsilon_0 k \coth(kz) - 2xy\epsilon_0 k \operatorname{cosech}(kz))\right] \\ & \times \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} a_f^{(2)}(k) y^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where  $a_f^{(1)}(k)$  is the solution of Eq. (16) with some initial conditions (which for an infinite slab do not have to be specified) given at  $z = z' = -L_1$  to zero with  $\omega = k$  and  $M(z) = \epsilon(z)$  and  $a_f^{(2)}(k)$  is the corresponding quantity for the slab 2 (with initial conditions given at  $z = z' = L_2 + l$  and evaluated at  $z = l$ ).

We thus find that the  $l$ -dependent part of the free energy of the mode  $\mathbf{k}$  (up to a bulk term which can be subtracted off to get the effective interaction.) is given by

$$F_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{k_B T}{2} \ln \left( 1 - \frac{(a_f^{(1)}(k) - \epsilon_0 k)(a_f^{(2)}(k) - \epsilon_0 k)}{(a_f^{(1)}(k) + \epsilon_0 k)(a_f^{(2)}(k) + \epsilon_0 k)} \exp(-2kl) \right), \quad (19)$$

with the total  $l$  dependent free energy given by

$$F = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} F_{\mathbf{k}}. \quad (20)$$

In order to evaluate the integrals of  $a_f^{(1,2)}(k)$ , one first has to solve equations of motion Eqs. (16) to get the  $z$  dependence of  $a_f(k, z)$  and then proceed to the integrals that enter Eq. (19). The evolution equation for  $a_f(k)$  for either slab can be read off from Eq. (16) and is given by

$$\frac{da_f(k, z)}{dz} = \epsilon(z)k^2 - \frac{a_f^2}{\epsilon(z)}, \quad (21)$$

where we have dropped the explicit dependence on the initial point  $z' = -L_1$ . Though it does not look like it at the first sight, this equation is simply a rewriting of the underlying Poisson equation for the original, charge free, dielectric system. This can be seen as follows. Assume first of all that  $a_f(k, z)$  can be parameterized with a function  $\psi(k, z)$  as

$$a_f(k, z) = \epsilon(z) \frac{d}{dz} \ln \psi(k, z). \quad (22)$$

In quantum mechanics problems with disorder the above change of variables is often used since in the presence of disorder nonlinear first order equation is easier to analyze than the second order linear equation [8]. Inserting now this *ansatz* back into Eq. (21) we find that it implies

$$\frac{d}{dz} \left( \epsilon \frac{d\psi}{dz} \right) - \epsilon k^2 \psi = 0, \quad (23)$$

for  $\psi(k, z)$ , which, is nothing but the Poisson equation for an inhomogeneous dielectric, where the inhomogeneity is only in the  $z$  direction, which has been Fourier transformed in the directions perpendicular to  $z$ . The  $a_f(k, z)$  in Eq. (22) is thus given by the solution of the Poisson equation in the specified planar geometry. This is of course no surprise since we are indeed dealing with an inhomogeneous electrostatic problem. On the other hand the derivation presented above is completely equivalent to the transfer matrix method [6] or to the density functional method [9] for evaluating the van der Waals forces. One of the clear strengths of this method is that it allows the of computation the van der Waals interaction to be carried out using a local method where the coefficients  $a_f$ ,  $a_f$  and  $b$  for any of the media involved can be computed and then the interactions between any combinations of media can be worked out in terms of these coefficients.

If we now write  $a_f^{(i)}(k, z) = k\alpha^{(i)}(k, z)$  and if the distributions of the  $\alpha^{(i)}(k, z) = y$  are given by  $p_i(k, y)$  then we find that, in three dimensions the average  $l$  dependent free energy is given by

$$\langle F \rangle = \frac{k_B T A}{4\pi} \int dk k \int dy_1 \int dy_2 p_1(k, y_1) p_2(k, y_2) \ln \left( 1 - \frac{(y_1 - \epsilon_0)(y_2 - \epsilon_0)}{(y_1 + \epsilon_0)(y_2 + \epsilon_0)} \exp(-2kl) \right), \quad (24)$$

where the angled bracket on the l.h.s. indicates the disorder average over the dielectric constant within the slabs and we have assumed that the realizations of the disorder in the two slabs are independent. This is why the joint disorder probability distribution is multiplicative for the two layers.

In the case where the slab thickness is large,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , it is simple to derive a scaling formula from Eq. (21) for the probability distribution. Let  $\epsilon(z) = \epsilon_g f(z)$  where  $f(z)$  is an instance drawn from an ensemble distributed according to a given distribution. Then  $p(k, y; \epsilon_g)$  is the resulting distribution for  $y$  given the mode wave-vector  $k$ . We then find that

$$p(k, y; \lambda \epsilon_g) = \frac{1}{\lambda} p(k, y/\lambda; \epsilon_g). \quad (25)$$

Thus, we need to compute the probability distribution once only, say for  $\epsilon_g = 1$ , and obtain those for other values of  $\epsilon_g$  using this scaling result.

### C. Large $l$ limit

Let us first investigate the form of van der Waals interaction free energy in the limit of large separations between the two slabs. The equation obeyed by  $\alpha$  is

$$\frac{d\alpha(k, z)}{dz} = \epsilon k - \frac{k\alpha^2}{\epsilon}, \quad (26)$$

which can be written as

$$\frac{d\alpha(k, \zeta)}{d\zeta} = \epsilon(\zeta/k) - \frac{\alpha^2}{\epsilon(\zeta/k)}, \quad (27)$$

with  $\zeta = zk$ . When  $k$  is small  $\epsilon(\zeta/k)$  varies very rapidly and thus becomes de-correlated from the value of  $\alpha$ . The Laplace transform for the probability density function of  $\alpha$  is defined by

$$\tilde{p}(k, s, \zeta) = \int_0^\infty dy \exp(-sy) p(k, y, \zeta) = \langle \exp(-s\alpha(k, \zeta)) \rangle, \quad (28)$$

and, from the equation of motion Eq. (26), obeys

$$-\frac{1}{s} \frac{d\tilde{p}(k, s, \zeta)}{d\zeta} = -\frac{1}{s} \frac{d}{d\zeta} \langle \exp(-s\alpha(k, \zeta)) \rangle = \left\langle \epsilon(\zeta/k) \exp(-s\alpha(k, \zeta)) - \frac{\alpha^2}{\epsilon(\zeta/k)} \exp(-s\alpha(k, \zeta)) \right\rangle. \quad (29)$$

Assuming that  $k$  is small and thus  $\alpha(k, \zeta)$  and  $\epsilon(\zeta/k)$  are de-correlated we can write

$$-\frac{1}{s} \frac{d\tilde{p}(k, s, \zeta)}{d\zeta} = \langle \epsilon \rangle \tilde{p}(k, s, \zeta) - \langle 1/\epsilon \rangle \frac{d^2}{ds^2} \tilde{p}(k, s, \zeta) . \quad (30)$$

This equation has the large  $\zeta$  equilibrium solution (justified as we are taking the limit  $L_1, L_2 \rightarrow \infty$ )

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{p}(k, s, \zeta) = \exp(-\epsilon^* s) , \quad (31)$$

with

$$\epsilon^* = \sqrt{\frac{\langle \epsilon \rangle}{\langle 1/\epsilon \rangle}} . \quad (32)$$

Inverting the Laplace transform then gives the equilibrium distribution

$$p(y, k) = \delta(y - \epsilon^*) \quad (33)$$

at small  $k$ . When  $l$  is large the integral in Eq. (24) is dominated by the small  $k$  behavior and we may use the analysis presented above, especially Eq. (33) in Eq. (24), to give the following asymptotic form for the interaction free energy

$$\langle F \rangle(l \rightarrow \infty) \sim \frac{k_B T A}{16\pi l^2} \int u du \ln(1 - \Delta_1^* \Delta_2^* \exp(-u)) \sim -\frac{H^*}{l^2} , \quad (34)$$

with

$$\Delta_i^* = \frac{(\epsilon_i^* - \epsilon_0)}{(\epsilon_i^* + \epsilon_0)} , \quad (35)$$

and where  $\epsilon_i^*$  are defined via Eq. (32). The subscript  $i$  on the angled brackets signifies that we are averaging the dielectric constant in the slab  $i$ . The term  $H^*$  defines an effective disorder-dependent Hamaker coefficient.

This result can be obtained via another more physical argument. The random layered materials can be replaced by an effective anisotropic medium where the dielectric tensor is non isotropic and has the form

$$\epsilon_{zz}^{(e)} = \epsilon_{||} , \quad (36)$$

$$\epsilon_{xx}^{(e)} = \epsilon_{yy}^{(e)} = \epsilon_{\perp} , \quad (37)$$

all other terms being zero by symmetry. The term  $\epsilon_{||}$  is the dielectric constant in the  $z$  direction is known exactly and is given by

$$\epsilon_{||}^{(e)} = \frac{1}{\langle 1/\epsilon \rangle} , \quad (38)$$

and the perpendicular component is simply given by

$$\epsilon_{\perp}^{(e)} = \langle \epsilon \rangle . \quad (39)$$

The forms of  $\epsilon_{||}^{(e)}$  and  $\epsilon_{\perp}^{(e)}$  follow simply from the fact that in the perpendicular direction the dielectric constant is obtained by analogy to capacitors in series and in the parallel direction by analogy to capacitors in parallel arrangement [10].

It is a straightforward exercise to see that the effective value of  $\epsilon^*$  for this system coincides with that of Eq. (32) above. This correspondence makes physical sense since the high wave length or small  $k$  fluctuations of the electric field are responsible for the behavior of the Casimir interaction at large distances and the effective dielectric response at low (but non-zero  $k$ ) must be close to that of the response to a constant field *i.e.* described in terms of a dielectric constant. An interesting consequence of this result is that for large separations (where  $l$  is much greater than the correlation length of the dielectric disorder) the thermal Casimir interaction free energy is self averaging.

It is instructive to compare the result for the Casimir interaction at large separations in the case of a fluctuating dielectric constant and in the case of a homogeneous medium, whose dielectric constant is the average of that in

the fluctuating medium:  $\epsilon_h = \langle \epsilon \rangle$  (the subscript  $h$  signifying that the medium is homogeneous). The homogeneous medium has a Hamaker constant

$$H_h = -\frac{k_B T}{16\pi} \int u du \ln(1 - \Delta_h^2 \exp(-u)), \quad (40)$$

with

$$\Delta_h = \frac{\langle \epsilon \rangle - \epsilon_0}{\langle \epsilon \rangle + \epsilon_0}, \quad (41)$$

when the medium (1) has the same composition as the medium (2). Jensen's inequality tells us that

$$\langle 1/\epsilon \rangle \geq \frac{1}{\langle \epsilon \rangle} \quad (42)$$

since the function  $f(x) = 1/x$  is convex. Thus

$$\epsilon^* = \sqrt{\frac{\langle \epsilon \rangle}{\langle 1/\epsilon \rangle}} \leq \langle \epsilon \rangle \quad (43)$$

Clearly the effective Hamaker constant is a monotonic function of  $\Delta^2$  and the interaction is always attractive. The difference in  $\Delta^2$  for the two systems is

$$\Delta^{*2} - \Delta_h^2 = 4 \frac{\epsilon_0(\epsilon^* - \langle \epsilon \rangle)(\epsilon^* \langle \epsilon \rangle - \epsilon_0^2)}{(\langle \epsilon \rangle + \epsilon_0)^2(\epsilon^* + \epsilon_0)^2}. \quad (44)$$

Therefore, using Eq. (43), we find that, if  $\epsilon^* \langle \epsilon \rangle > \epsilon_0^2$  then  $H_h > H^*$ , and the interaction between the two homogeneous media is stronger than that between the two fluctuating media. This condition can be written as

$$\frac{\langle \epsilon \rangle^3}{\langle 1/\epsilon \rangle} > \epsilon_0^4 \quad (45)$$

and is always satisfied if  $\langle 1/\epsilon \rangle^{-1} > \epsilon_0$ . However it is always violated (the interaction between the homogeneous media is weaker than that between the random media) if  $\langle \epsilon \rangle < \epsilon_0$ . We thus see that, depending on the details of the distribution of the fluctuating dielectric response in the two slabs and the dielectric response of the medium in-between, the effective interaction at large inter-slab separations can be stronger or weaker than that for a uniform medium with a dielectric constant equal to the average value of that of the media in which it fluctuates.

#### D. Small $l$ limit

One would imagine that as the distance between the slabs is reduced the result will be increasingly dominated by the slab composition at the two opposite faces [2]. Indeed in the small  $l$  limit Eq. (24) is dominated by the large  $k$  behavior. The asymptotic behavior can be extracted if one assumes the *ansatz*

$$\alpha(z, k) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n(z)}{k^n}. \quad (46)$$

Substituting this into Eq. (26) gives the following chain of equations for  $\alpha_n(z)$

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^n} \frac{d\alpha_n(z)}{dz} = \epsilon(z) - \frac{1}{\epsilon(z)} \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n(z)\alpha_m(z)}{k^{m+n}}. \quad (47)$$

From here it is easy to see that to order  $O(1)$  the leading asymptotic result of Eq. (52) is given by

$$\alpha_0(z) = \epsilon(z). \quad (48)$$

The equation for the corrections ( $n \geq 1$ ) to this asymptotic limit is

$$\frac{d\alpha_{n-1}(z)}{dz} = -\frac{1}{\epsilon(z)} \sum_{m=0}^n \alpha_m(z) \alpha_{n-m}(z), \quad (49)$$

and the next two terms in the asymptotic expansion are given by

$$\alpha_1(z) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d\epsilon(z)}{dz}, \quad (50)$$

$$\alpha_2(z) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{d^2\epsilon(z)}{dz^2} - \frac{1}{8\epsilon(z)} \left( \frac{d\epsilon(z)}{dz} \right)^2. \quad (51)$$

It is straightforward to realize that these terms generate  $O(1/l)$  corrections to the asymptotic result which are subdominant when  $l$  is large. Thus to the leading order

$$\alpha(z, k) \approx \alpha_0(z) = \epsilon(z) \quad (52)$$

and from here it follows straightforwardly that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p_i(y, k) = \rho_i(\epsilon) \quad (53)$$

where  $\rho_i$  is the probability density function of  $\epsilon(z)$  in medium  $i$ . This result is easily understood from the physical discussion above. The average of the thermal Casimir interaction free energy Eq. (24) in the small separation limit is thus given by

$$\langle F \rangle(l \rightarrow 0) \sim \frac{k_B T}{16\pi l^2} \int u du \int d\epsilon_1 d\epsilon_2 \rho_1(\epsilon_1) \rho_2(\epsilon_2) \ln(1 - \Delta_1 \Delta_2 \exp(-u)), \quad (54)$$

with

$$\Delta_i = \frac{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_0}{\epsilon_i + \epsilon_0}. \quad (55)$$

The forms of the thermal Casimir interaction free energy are thus given by Eqs. (54) and (34) in the small and large inter-slab separation limits respectively. We have thus obtained the limiting behavior of the thermal Casimir effect in the limit of large separation between the slabs, where the free energy is given by self-averaging and thus the distributions of  $\alpha(k, z)$  are strongly peaked, and in the limit of small separation, where the free energy is a random variable that has to be averaged over the probability density function of the dielectric constant in the media composing the two interacting slabs.

### III. SMALL DISORDER LIMIT - PERTURBATION THEORY

The analysis presented above is valid for any type of disorder, irrespective of its properties. Here we also investigate a different approach that takes into account the disorder effects on a perturbative level *i.e.* another way of approaching this problem analytically is to assume that the disorder is small. We assume in this case that the dielectric response can be written with an *ansatz* of the form

$$\epsilon(z) = \epsilon_g \exp(\lambda \phi(z)), \quad (56)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a scalar parameterizing the strength of disorder which will be used as the expansion parameter for perturbation theory. When  $\lambda = 0$  we have the disorder free homogeneous system which is the starting point for the perturbation expansion (zeroth order). If the mean of the field of  $\phi$  is zero then  $\epsilon_g$  is the geometric mean of the dielectric constant. We now assume that  $\lambda$  is small and write

$$\alpha(z, k) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda^n \alpha_n(z, k). \quad (57)$$



Substituting this into Eq. (26) and matching the powers of  $\lambda$ , we obtain the following equations for the first three terms in the perturbation expansion when  $z$  is large:

$$\alpha_0 = \epsilon_g, \quad (58)$$

$$\frac{d\alpha_1}{dz} = k(-2\alpha_1 + 2\epsilon_g\phi), \quad (59)$$

$$\frac{d\alpha_2}{dz} = k(-2\alpha_2 - \frac{\alpha_1^2}{\epsilon_g} + 2\alpha_1\phi). \quad (60)$$

At large  $z$  we can solve the last two equations to obtain

$$\alpha_1 = 2k\epsilon_g \int_0^z dz' \exp(-2k(z-z'))\phi(z'), \quad (61)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2 = & 4k^2\epsilon_g \int_0^z dz' \exp(-2k(z-z'))\phi(z') \int_0^{z'} dz'' \exp(-2k(z'-z''))\phi(z'') \\ & - 4k^3\epsilon_g \int_0^z dz \exp(-2k(z-z')) \left[ \int_0^{z'} dz'' \exp(-2k(z'-z''))\phi(z'') \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

We can now verify some of our previous results at the level of perturbation theory. For  $k \rightarrow \infty$  we have that  $2k \exp(-2k(z-z')) \rightarrow \delta(z-z')$ , and this gives

$$\alpha_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_g \phi(z), \quad (63)$$

$$\alpha_2 \rightarrow \frac{\epsilon_g}{2} \phi^2(z). \quad (64)$$

This gives

$$\alpha \rightarrow \epsilon_g(1 + \lambda\phi + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\phi^2) \approx \epsilon_g \exp(\lambda\phi) = \epsilon(z) \quad (65)$$

in agreement with the large  $k$  result stated previously. Also in the limit of small  $k$  we will have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} 2k \int_0^z dz' \exp(-2k(z-z'))\phi(z') \rightarrow \langle \phi \rangle, \quad (66)$$

for large  $z$  and so we have

$$\alpha_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_g \langle \phi \rangle, \quad (67)$$

$$\alpha_2 \rightarrow \frac{\epsilon_g}{2} \langle \phi \rangle^2. \quad (68)$$

Since  $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$ , we find

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \alpha(z, k) = \epsilon_g, \quad (69)$$

which is in agreement (to  $O(\lambda^2)$ ) with the general result Eq. (32).

Now let us consider the case where the field  $\phi$  is Gaussian of zero mean with correlation function

$$\langle \phi(z)\phi(z') \rangle = \exp(-\omega|z-z'|), \quad (70)$$

where  $1/\omega$  is the correlation length of the field. This Gaussian field has the correlation function of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process and is Markovian. The moments relevant to the degree in perturbation theory we are working to ( $O(\lambda^2)$ ) are

$$\langle \alpha_1 \rangle = 0, \quad (71)$$

$$\langle \alpha_1^2 \rangle = \frac{2k\epsilon_g^2}{2k + \omega}, \quad (72)$$

$$\langle \alpha_2 \rangle = \frac{k\epsilon_g}{2k + \omega}. \quad (73)$$




FIG. 2: Probability density for  $\alpha$  for  $k = 1, 0.1, 0.01$  for  $\epsilon(z) = \exp(\phi(z))$  where  $\phi$  is the OU Gaussian process with correlation function given by Eq. (70). The distribution  $p(y, k)$  becomes sharply peaked around  $y = 1$  which is as predicted for small  $k$ ,  $\epsilon^*$  given by Eq. (32)

Using this we may write the corresponding free energy as a random variable

$$F = \frac{k_B T}{16\pi l^2} \int u du \ln(1 - \Delta'_1 \Delta'_2 \exp(-u)) , \quad (74)$$

where

$$\Delta'_i = \frac{\epsilon'_i - \epsilon_0}{\epsilon'_i + \epsilon_0} , \quad (75)$$

with

$$\epsilon'_i = \epsilon_{g,i} \left( 1 + \lambda \sqrt{\frac{u}{u + \omega_i l}} \sigma_i + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \frac{u}{u + \omega_i l} \right) . \quad (76)$$

The subscript  $i$  refers to the medium (1, or 2) and the  $\sigma_i$  are independent Gaussian random variables of zero mean and unit variance. Note that to order  $\lambda^2$  we can replace the term  $\alpha_2$  by its mean and have done so in the above. Also we should expand the corresponding expression for the free energy to order  $\lambda^2$ , this will ensure that the resulting average and moments will always be finite.

#### IV. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section we perform some numerical simulations to verify the general asymptotic behavior of the Casimir free energy that we have analyzed in earlier sections. For large slab separation (large  $l$ ) the results are summarized by Eqs. (33) and (32), and in the small separation limit (small  $l$ ) we expect Eq. (53) to hold. We present simulations to show that these equations are indeed correct in the relevant limit.

We recall that for small  $k$  the values of  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  are predicted to be self averaging and thus their distributions should be strongly peaked as  $k \rightarrow 0$ .

In Fig (2) we have simulated the system when  $\epsilon$  is given by Eq. (56) and  $\phi$  is an OU Gaussian process (with  $\lambda = 1$  and  $\epsilon_g = 1$  in Eq. (56) and  $\omega = 1$  in Eq. (70)) for values of  $k = 1$  to 0.01. We see that as predicted the distribution of  $\alpha$  becomes increasingly peaked about  $\epsilon^* = 1$  (as given by Eq. (32)) as the value of  $k$  is decreased. For large  $k$  the prediction Eq. (53) can be verified. Shown in Fig. (4) is the distribution for the same distribution of  $\epsilon(z)$  but for  $k = 10$ , we see that, as predicted, the probability density function for  $\alpha$  is already very close to that of  $\epsilon$  which is given by

$$q(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi y}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \ln^2(y)\right) . \quad (77)$$




FIG. 3: Probability density for  $\alpha$  for  $k = 1, 0.1, 0.01$  for  $\epsilon(z) = \exp(\phi(z))$  where  $\phi$  is the Gaussian process with correlation function given by Eq. (78). As for the OU process the distribution  $p(y, k)$  becomes sharply peaked around  $y = 1$  which is as predicted for small  $k$ , and  $\epsilon^*$  is given by Eq. (32)

Note that  $q(y)$  is independent of the correlation function of the Gaussian field in the log-normal distribution.

One can also consider the case of non-Markovian log-normal dielectric constants. For instance one can take the field  $\phi$  in Eq. (56) to have correlation function

$$\langle \phi(z)\phi(z') \rangle = \exp(-\omega^2(z - z')^2/2). \quad (78)$$

In what follows we fix  $\lambda = 1$  and  $\omega = 1$ . For the small values of  $k$  shown in Fig. (3) we see again that as  $k \rightarrow 0$  that the distribution becomes peaked about  $\epsilon^* = 1$  as predicted. In Fig (5) we show the comparison between the distribution of  $\alpha$  and  $\epsilon$ , again at this value of  $k$  the agreement between the two distributions is already excellent.

We can also compute the average effective Hamaker coefficient as a function of separation  $l$  using Eq. (24) to define

$$\langle H(l) \rangle = \frac{k_B T}{16\pi} \int u du \int dy_1 dy_2 p_1(u/2l, y_1) p_2(u/2l, y_2) \ln(1 - \Delta(y_1)\Delta(y_2) \exp(-u)), \quad (79)$$

with  $\Delta(y) = (y - \epsilon_0)/(y + \epsilon_0)$ . For  $\epsilon(z)$  distributed according to the log-normal distribution in Eq. (56) and using the scaling result in Eq. (25) we can write

$$\langle H(l; \epsilon_g) \rangle = \frac{k_B T}{16\pi} \int u du \int dy_1 dy_2 p_1(u/2l, y_1) p_2(u/2l, y_2) \ln(1 - \Delta(\epsilon_g y_1)\Delta(\epsilon_g y_2) \exp(-u)) \quad (80)$$

where the  $p_i(k, y)$  are computed for  $\epsilon_g = 1$ . We show  $H(l; \epsilon_g)$  versus  $l$  in Figs. (6) and (7) for various values of  $\epsilon_g$ .

As can be seen  $H(l)$  is asymptotic to the Hamaker constant for a homogeneous system with dielectric constant  $\epsilon^* = \sqrt{\langle \epsilon \rangle / \langle 1/\epsilon \rangle}$ , and that for  $\epsilon_g = 1.0$  that  $H(l)$  is asymptotic to zero from above showing that the force is attractive for all  $l$ . This need not have been the case since there will be contributions from configurations where the dielectric constants  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2$  in the slabs satisfy  $\epsilon_1 > 1 > \epsilon_2$  or vice-versa; such configurations contribute a repulsive contribution to the force. As is also observed, the curves are either asymptotic from above or below and are not necessarily monotonic but can have an initial decrease before rising to the asymptotic value. These are new and significant features due to the random nature of the system.

In Figs (8) and (9) we show a sample of the Hamaker coefficients for particular realizations of  $\epsilon(z)$  plotted against separation  $l$  and for  $\epsilon_g = 2.0, 10.0$ , respectively. The averages over the ensembles from which these curves are taken are given in Fig. (7). It is important to note that the curvatures of the ensemble curves are not of definite sign and that for small  $l$  there are both curves that decrease and curves that increase with  $l$ . These properties are reflected in the shape of the curve for the ensemble average.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

We have obtained the limiting behavior of the thermal Casimir effect in the limit of large separation between the slabs, where the free energy is given by self-averaging and thus the distributions of  $\alpha(k, z)$  are strongly peaked. We




FIG. 4: The filled circles are the probability density for  $\alpha$  for  $k = 10$  for  $\epsilon(z) = \exp(\phi(z))$  here  $\phi$  is the OU Gaussian process with correlation function given by Eq. (70) with  $\omega = 1$ . The solid line is the probability density function  $q(y)$  given in Eq. (77) for the same distribution of  $\epsilon$ . The two distributions are already very close for  $k = 10$  in agreement with the prediction of Eq. (53).




FIG. 5: The filled circles are the probability density for  $\alpha$  for  $k = 100$  for  $\epsilon(z) = \exp(\phi(z))$  here  $\phi$  is the Gaussian process with correlation function given by Eq. (78) with  $\omega = 1$ . The solid line is the probability density function  $q(y)$  given in Eq. (77) for the same distribution of  $\epsilon$ . The two distributions are already very close for  $k = 10$  in agreement with the prediction of Eq. (53).

have shown that the interaction between two homogeneous media is stronger than that between the two fluctuating media if  $\langle 1/\epsilon \rangle^{-1} > \epsilon_0$ . However it is always weaker if  $\langle \epsilon \rangle < \epsilon_0$ . We thus see that, depending on the details of the distribution of the fluctuating dielectric response in the two slabs and the dielectric response of the medium in-between, the effective interaction at large inter-slab separations can be stronger or weaker than that for a uniform medium with a dielectric function equal to the average value of that of the media in which it fluctuates. In the limit of small separation, where the interaction free energy is a random variable that has to be averaged over the probability density function of the dielectric functions in the media composing the two interacting slabs.

The intermediate length scales were analyzed *via* perturbation theory and models of disorder that can be treated numerically. All numerical simulations completely corroborate the analytical results for self-averaging at large separations

The non-linear formulation of the problem presented here should be equally useful to treat the case of deterministically varying dielectric functions and could open up a useful computational framework for designing materials where the effective interaction can be tuned, to induce attractive or repulsive forces depending on the separation [11]. The formulation also means that if one knows the coefficients  $a_i(k)$ ,  $a_f(k)$  and  $b_j(k)$  for any set of slab media, then one




FIG. 6: The effective Hamaker coefficient  $H(l)$  defined in Eq. (80) for the distribution defined by Eqns. (56) and (78) for  $\epsilon_g = 1.0, 1.414$ . In both cases the curves are asymptotic to the Hamaker constant for a homogeneous system with dielectric constant  $\epsilon^* = \sqrt{\langle\epsilon\rangle/\langle 1/\epsilon\rangle}$ . Notably,  $\epsilon^* = 1$  for  $\epsilon_g = 1.0$  and we see that  $H(l)$  is asymptotic to zero from above showing that the force is attractive for all  $l$  even in this case. As is also seen, the curves are asymptotic either above or below depending on the value of  $\epsilon_g$  and is not necessarily monotonic.




FIG. 7: The effective Hamaker coefficient  $\langle H(l) \rangle$  defined in Eq. (80) for the distribution defined by Eqns. (56) and (78) for  $\epsilon_g = 2.0, 10.0$ . In both cases the curves are asymptotic to the Hamaker constant for a homogeneous system with dielectric constant  $\epsilon^* = \sqrt{\langle\epsilon\rangle/\langle 1/\epsilon\rangle}$ .

can immediately compute the effective interaction between them at any distance. This is a rather surprising result as if one wanted to compute the effective interaction between two media (1) and (2) using the pair wise approximation,  $1/r^6$  for the van der Waals interaction, it is clear that medium (1) needs to know what is in medium (2) at each point in order to compute the force. The decomposition in terms of Fourier modes however means that the interaction between the two media is effectively factorized. A number of further applications of our method would be to examine the role of disorder for the non-zero frequencies corresponding to quantum fluctuations and also for different geometries, such as cylindrical and spherical, when the dielectric function varies only in the radial direction. An interesting open problem concerns what happens when the dielectric function varies in all directions, it would be interesting to know if one can prove in this case whether the long-distance interaction between two slabs is also given by the same effective medium expression as derived here.




FIG. 8: Examples of the Hamaker coefficient from the ensemble generated by the distribution for  $\epsilon(z)$  for  $\epsilon_g = 2.0$  plotted versus separation  $l$ . The average curve of the ensemble is shown in Fig. (7). Note that for small  $l$  the curvature of the ensemble curves are not of definite sign




FIG. 9: Examples of the Hamaker coefficient from the ensemble generated by the distribution for  $\epsilon(z)$  for  $\epsilon_g = 10.0$  plotted versus separation  $l$ . The average curve of the ensemble is shown in Fig. (7). Note that the curvatures of the ensemble curves are not of definite sign.

### Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY05-51164 (while at the KITP program *The theory and practice of fluctuation induced interactions*, UCSB, 2008). D.S.D acknowledges support from the Institut Universitaire de France. R.P. would like to acknowledge the financial support by the Agency for Research and Development of Slovenia, Grants No. P1-0055C, No. Z1-7171, No. L2- 7080. This study was supported in part by the Intramural Research Program of the NIH, Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

---

[1] J. Mahanty and B. W. Ninham, *Dispersion Forces* (Academic Press, 1976)

- [2] V.A. Parsegian, *Van der Waals Forces* (Cambridge, 2006)
- [3] I.E. Dzyaloshinskii, E.M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskii, *Advan. Phys.* **10**, 165, 1961
- [4] H. B. G. Casimir, *Proc. K. Ned. Akad. Wet.* **51**, 793 (1948).
- [5] D. S. Dean, R. R. Horgan, A. Naji and R. Podgornik, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 040101 (2009)
- [6] R. Podgornik and V.A. Parsegian, *J. Chem. Phys.* **121**, 7467 (2004)
- [7] D.S. Dean and R.R. Horgan, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 061603 (2002); *ibid* **71**, 041907, (2005); *ibid* **76**, 041102 (2007); *J. Phys. C.* **17**, 3473, (2005)
- [8] C. Itzykson and J.-M. Drouffe, *Statistical Field Theory: Strong Coupling, Monte Carlo Methods, Conformal Field Theory and Random Systems*, Vol. 2, (Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- [9] G. Veble and R. Podgornik, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 155102 (2007)
- [10] R. Podgornik and V.A. Parsegian, *J. Chem. Phys.* **120**, 3401 (2004)
- [11] J. Bàrcenas, L. Reyes and R. Esquivel-Sirvent, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **87**, 263106 (2005); J. N. Munday, F. Capasso and V.A. Parsegian, *Nature* **457**, 170 (2009)